

## The *Koina* of Epirus and Macedonia

N. G. L. HAMMOND

It is a particular pleasure to pay tribute to the outstanding scholarship and warm friendship of Fritz Solmsen, whom I first knew at Cambridge in the 1930s. Then he was my host at the Institute for Research in the Humanities at Madison, Wisconsin, in 1975–76 and in 1977, and he and Lieselotte were most welcoming to my wife and me. Our friendship was renewed most happily in Chapel Hill in 1986, when I was working at the National Center for the Humanities. On many occasions, and especially at Madison, where I took some seminars on Herodotus for him, we discussed many problems of Macedonian history and he approached them all with his fresh and penetrating mind and a wonderful grasp of the Greek language. The subject which I have chosen is such as we discussed then.

The term τὸ κοινόν was much in use in what we now call Northern Greece in the fourth century B.C. In the treaty of c. 393 between "Amyntas, son of Errhidaeus" and "Chalcideis" there were arrangements for the export of such timber products "as τὸ κοινόν does not need," and for financial conditions affecting τὸ κοινόν, i.e. the "Chalcideis" (Tod, *GHI* 111. 11–12). The term τὸ κοινόν was certainly the official designation in use, because the inscribed stone was found at Olynthus and gave the Chalcidian version of the treaty. The literal meaning of τὸ κοινόν is not "the state" or "the league" as in LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. κοινός, but "the community" or "the commonality." If we keep to the literal meaning, there is no difference in essence between the following examples of its use over a wide span, geographically and chronologically: τὸ κοινόν τῶν Ἰώνων (Hdt. 5. 109. 3), Σπαρτιητέων τὸ κοινόν (Hdt. 1. 67. 5), Αἰτωλῶν τὸ κοινόν (Tod, *GHI* 137. 9 and 17), Μολοσσῶν τὸ κοινόν (*SGDI* 1334), τὸ κοινόν Μακεδόνων (*IG* XI. 4. 1102), κοινόν τῶν Παιόνων (*SIG* 394) and κοινόν τῶν Βυλλιόνων (*PAE* [1965] 59). In each case it was "the community."

The literal meaning was prominent in such expressions as ἡ κοινὴ εἰρήνη "the communal peace" (Tod, *GHI* 145. 6 and 11 τὴν νῦν γεγεννημένην ἡμῖν εἰρήνην; cf. 177. 21), ἡ κοινὴ συμμαχία, "the communal coalition" (Plb. 4. 9. 2, being the so-called Symmarchy, organised by Antigonus Doson). When the Apeirotai banished the

Molossian king Aeacides in 317, they passed a communal decision, κοινὸν δόγμα τῶν Ἑπειρωτῶν (Diod. 19. 36. 4).

The members which made up τὸ κοινόν were not political units, such as city-states, tribes or leagues, but people. Thus in the so-called Corinthian League of 337 those sharing in "the common peace" were named in the inscription, the certain surviving names being Thessalians, Thasians, Ambraciotes, Phocians, Locrians, Malians, Dolopes, Perhaebians and Cephallenians (Tod, *GHI* 177). We may make the comment that some were organised in tribes, others in city-states and others in federal systems; but those distinctions are not to be deduced from "the common peace." And vice versa it is a mistake to infer from τὸ κοινόν or ἡ κοινὴ συμμαχία that its members were organised only in one political form.<sup>1</sup> There is no doubt that any group of individuals could employ the expression. Thus the Spartiatai, who were the elite citizens of the Lacedaemonian state, were described by Herodotus as Σπαρτιητέων τὸ κοινόν (1. 67. 5). There was no implication that the Spartiatai were a federated body or a city-state. They were a "community" of armed warriors, led by two kings elected from one family.

The area in which this type of community survived and flourished until the Roman conquest was most markedly Epirus, and the reason for that survival was the fact that the transhumant form of pastoralism continued from early times into the Hellenistic period.<sup>2</sup> The evidence is provided by a large number of inscriptions which reveal an extraordinary number of ethnic terms and many decisions taken by ethnic κοινά. The basic unit was a small community such as the Aterargoi, τὸ κοινόν τῶν Ἀτεράργων, which passed its own resolutions (*Ep. Chron.* 1935. 261; *Epirus* 536). When such a community was threatened, it tended to associate itself with other such communities. Together they formed a cluster with a new

The following abbreviations are used in this article:

CAH	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , 2nd ed.
Epirus	N. G. L. Hammond, <i>Epirus</i> (Oxford 1967)
Errington	R. M. Errington, <i>Geschichte Makedoniens</i> (Munich 1986)
HMac I	N. G. L. Hammond, <i>A History of Macedonia I</i> (Oxford 1972)
HMac II	N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, <i>A History of Macedonia II</i> (Oxford 1979)
HMac III	N. G. L. Hammond and F. W. Walbank, <i>A History of Macedonia III</i> (Oxford 1988)
Mac State	N. G. L. Hammond, <i>The Macedonian State</i> (Oxford 1989)
Walbank	F. W. Walbank, <i>A Historical Commentary on Polybius I-III</i> (Oxford 1957-79)

<sup>1</sup> This was implied, when the Symmachy was defined as "a League of Confederacies" (Walbank I 256) or "a League of Leagues" (CAH VII. 1. 468). The strongest member at the start—Macedonia—was not a confederacy nor a league, and later members did not have to become leagues. To say that "Macedones" (Plb. 4. 9. 4) were "perhaps only nominal members" is to go beyond the Greek words, probability and actuality.

<sup>2</sup> See *Epirus* 256 f. and 267 and *Mac State* 387, citing the results of a survey in North Pindus led by A. K. Vavritsas.

corporate name, e.g. Omphales. In course of time the clusters coalesced to form a larger association, again with a corporate name, e.g. Molossoi. The three stages led to an accumulation of ethnic terms: Thus we find Μολοσσοὶ Ὀμφάλες Χιμῳάριοι (*SGDI* 1347 of c. 330–310; *Epirus* 566) and Μολοσσὸς Ὀνόπερνος Καρτατός (*SGDI* 1346). To take another example, the Prasaebi, themselves a member of the larger association “The Chaones,” consisted of at least five subsidiary tribes, since the officials and members of their community had as ethnics Aixonios, Tharios, Kotulaios, O . . . atas and Prochtheios. Another cluster in the same region, the Pergamii, had as officials of their community men with the ethnics Acralestos and Charadros.

Of the larger associations in Epirus the Chaones and the Molossoi were known to Hecataeus in the sixth century (*FGrH* 1 F 103 and 108), and to them Thucydides adds Atintanes, Orestai, Parauaioi and Thesprotoi in the operations of 429 (2. 80. 5). The Dassaretii developed from being a constituent tribe of the Chaones in the sixth century as the Dexaroι (*FGrH* 1 F 103) into being an independent association. There were other associations to the southeast, such as the Agraioi (Thuc. 3. 106. 2). All these associations were liable to have a fluctuating membership; for the basic units—the small tribes—had freedom of choice and exercised it. Thus, according to Strabo 323–24, whose information was derived from Hecataeus, the Chaones were the strongest association in Epirus, probably in the period before the mid-sixth century. They were then overhauled by the Molossians, who had pride of place until c. 480. During their period of ascendancy the strongest centre of economic power was in the area north of Lake Ochrid (see *CAH* III. 3 [1982] 271). There were strong links at that time between Trebenishte, where the royal cemetery of the rulers north of Lake Ochrid was situated, and the oracular shrine of Dodona;<sup>3</sup> and Strabo attributed the Molossians’ rise to power to the fact that Dodona was “beside them” (cf. *FGrH* 1 F 108).

In this period the tribes of Upper Macedonia were members of the Molossian association, and they were called, e.g. Orestai Molossoi (*FGrH* 1 F 107 Ὀρέσται· Μολοσσικὸν ἔθνος). However, in the 480s most of them were brought into the sphere of the Macedonian king by Xerxes, when he was preparing his invasion of Greece,<sup>4</sup> and most of them from then onwards were “Macedones,” e.g. Λυγκηστῶν Μακεδόνων in Thuc. 4. 83. 1; cf. 2. 99. 2 τῶν γὰρ Μακεδόνων καὶ Λυγκησταὶ καὶ Ἑλιμιῶται. The Orestai may have been an exception, because they operated together with a western tribe, the Parauaei, in 429 (Thuc. 2. 80. 6). In the fourth century the Molossian association increased in power; for, as we see from inscriptions, its membership grew from ten to fifteen tribal groups, which included the Orestae (*SEG* XXIII 471. 13) and some that were previously members of the Thesprotoi (*Epirus* 527 and 530 f.).

<sup>3</sup> *Epirus* 437 f.

<sup>4</sup> Just. 7. 4. 1, as explained in *HMac* II 63 f.

Since the publication in 1956 of two inscriptions from Dodona it has been demonstrated beyond cavil that the tribes of the Molossian group were Greek-speaking in the latter part of the fifth century; for the names and the patronymics of men mentioned in the decisions of 370–68 B.C. were all Greek, and the language and the institutions of the inscription were entirely Greek. That is merely a *terminus ante quem* they spoke Greek. Moreover, the dialect of questions asked evidently by local persons at Dodona was West Greek, and not the Doric dialect of the Corinthian colonies which traded with the Molossian group. The conclusion is certain that these tribes were Greek-speaking from the beginning at least of the Iron Age. It follows that the tribes of Upper Macedonia were also speakers of Greek; for non-Greek-speakers would not have been admitted to a Greek association.<sup>5</sup> That they spoke the West Greek dialect is clear from an inscription in Seleucid Syria, in which there were magistrates with a West Greek termination *πελιγᾶνες*, and from the mention of *ἄδειγᾶνες* in Plb. 5. 54. 10.<sup>6</sup> The northern limit of the Greek-speaking tribes is supplied to us by Strabo 326; for they extended up to the southernmost Illyrian tribes, these being Bylliones, Taulantii, Parthini, Brygi and Enchelii (the last being around the northern part of Lake Ochrid),<sup>7</sup> and these Greek-speaking tribes (he has just mentioned the lands of the Pelagones, Lyncestae, Orestae and Elimeotae) were said “by some to have the same hair-style, dialect, cloak and suchlike things as far as Corcyra” (327).

The conditions of ancient transhumant pastoralism were unchanged until very recent times, when flocks of sheep were transported by car and winter pastures were turned into agricultural land. We can therefore gain some relevant information from the pastoral groups of the Sarakatsani and the Vlachs. The viable size of a group, known as a *parea* or *stani*, was between 200 and 500 persons, varying with the extent and quality of pastures. During the turbulence of the Turkish Empire some groups, which had been entirely nomadic, combined to form clusters and built villages in high Pindus at Vovoussa (four groups) and Avdhella (five groups), for instance. In each group the adult armed men met together to make some decisions for the group and to elect a leader of the group with wide powers (a *tselingas* or *tshelniku*). This leader usually held office for life, and his family being held in honour often provided his successor. The larger association, e.g. the armed men of Vovoussa, elected a leader from one of its

<sup>5</sup> The inscriptions, from Dodona, were published by D. Evangelides in *AE* (1956) 1 ff.; for comments see *Epirus* 524 ff. Inscriptions show that the names and the language of Upper Macedonia was Greek; see *HMac* I 90 and F. Papazoglou in *Chiron* 18 (1988) 250 f.

<sup>6</sup> For *peliganes* see *Syria* 23 (1942–43) 21 f. Walbank I 583 proposed to emend “*adeiganes*” to “*peliganes*” but not on any grounds of palaeography.

<sup>7</sup> This is disputed by Albanian scholars, e.g. in *Iliria* (1982) 2. 84 f. and (1984) 2. 79 f., and by P. Cabanes in *Iliria* (1986) 1. 83. See my arguments in *JRS* 79 (1989) 19 f.

constituent groups.<sup>8</sup> We see a similar system in the larger associations which Thucydides described briefly: The leader was normally a king, and where he was lacking, e.g. for the Chaones, the leaders were two men of "the ruling family" (Thuc. 2. 80. 5 ἐκ τοῦ ἀρχικοῦ γένους). The smaller, constituent groups are revealed in inscriptions as having each its own assembly and officials in the fourth and following centuries. For instance, there was mention c. 340 of a formal decision: ἔδοξε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν ... (SGDI 1335) and the officials included προστάται, of which Thucydides recorded an earlier instance (2. 80. 5 ἐπετησίῳ προστατείᾳ, among the Chaones). The community passed resolutions about its internal affairs and regulated relations with other communities.<sup>9</sup> The fact that they were all ultimately subsumed into τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀπειρωτῶν did not apparently diminish the vitality of their own institutions.

It is important to note that the expression τὸ κοινόν means a community of its own members and takes its corporate name for those members only. Thus κοινὸν τῶν Βυλλιόνων was the community of Bylliones. I stress this point, because some scholars have recently imported the concept of a federal system and have argued that the Greek words meant a "League" of which the Bylliones were a leading member and other groups such as the Amantes or Atintanes were members.<sup>10</sup> That, however, was not the sense of the word in the northwestern area; for the *koinon* of Apeirotai, Molossoi, Thesprotai, Aetoloi, Pergamioi, etc. in every case was the body of its internal members and not the basis of a wider confederation. Thus κοινὸν τῶν Βυλλιόνων was the community of the Bylliones, a group of Hellenised Illyrians who were bilingual (Strabo 326).

We have seen that the large tribal associations of what was called Upper Macedonia spoke the same dialect and had the same system of organisation as those of Epirus. The evidence for the small tribes is less rich than that for the small tribes of Epirus, probably because wood rather than stone was used for recording decisions in classical and early Hellenistic times. Even so, the evidence of Greek inscriptions of the early Roman Empire is valid for earlier times, because the Macedonians were an unusually conservative people. Inscriptions have recorded decisions by "Orestai" (IG XI. 4. 1118, third century B.C.), by τὸ κοινὸν Ὀρεστῶν (*Ziva Antika* 9 [1959] 163 f., first century A.D.) and by Ἐλημιωτῶν τὸ κοινόν (*Ancient Macedonia* II 130, second century A.D.). Within the association of the Pelagones it appears from inscriptions of the second century A.D. that a cluster of groups were called ἡ τῶν Ἀργεσταίων πόλις (*Spomenik* 71 [1931] no. 88) and that one of the units in the cluster was Νεαπολεϊτῶν τὸ κοινόν (ibid., no. 63). Another association, that of the Derriopes, was called δῆμος

<sup>8</sup> For a fuller description see my book, *Migrations and Invasions in Greece and Adjacent Areas* (Park Ridge, NJ 1976) 37–51.

<sup>9</sup> Examples are given in *Epirus* 525–40.

<sup>10</sup> See note 7 above, and add F. Papazoglou in *Historia* 35 (1986) 444.

Δερριόπων in an inscribed poem of the first century A.D. (*Chiron* 18 [1988] 237), and πόλις with πολιτάρχαι (L. A. Heuzey and L. Daumet, *Mission archéologique de Macédoine* [Paris 1876] 315). One of its constituent parts was Στυβερραίων ἡ πόλις (ibid., no. 501), cited as ἡ πόλις (*Chiron*, loc. cit.), another was Δοστωνέων τὸ κοινόν (*Spomenik*, loc. cit., no. 437), and a third part was the "Geneatai" (in Latin in *BCH* 47 [1923] no. 277).<sup>11</sup> In the land of the Lyncestae we hear only of "the villages of Arrhabaeus" in Thucydides' narrative (4. 124. 4 τὰς τοῦ Ἀρραβαίου κώμας); these may have corresponded with the small *koina* farther north.<sup>12</sup> In Orestis two parts of the association are known. An inscription of the second century A.D. from Sisanion mentions a πόλις (the name not surviving) and gives a list of ephebes.<sup>13</sup> An inscription of the same period recorded the decisions of a community called the Battynaioi, referred to as ἡ πολιτεία, with regard to grazing rights and the cutting of stakes (*JHS* 33 [1913] 337 f.); they were evidently a pastoral community.<sup>14</sup> In Elimeotis a decision was recorded κατὰ τὸ δόξαν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ (*AE* [1936] *Chron.* 10); it is evident that the Maleiatae (*vel sim.*) were a small tribal group within the association known as the Elimeotai.

Before we leave Epirus and Upper Macedonia we must consider the form of leadership in these tribal systems. Where ownership of flocks, pasture and timber was communal, it was essential that the leader, namely the elected *tselingas* or *tshelniku*, should have very strong powers of directing the movement and the activity of the "company," and of negotiating on its behalf with other groups and with settled communities. When groups joined together and formed a cluster, one of the group-leaders was elected leader of the cluster, exercised similar powers, and was often succeeded by a member of his family. The common name for such a leader was *basileus*, similar to *phylobasileus* in early Attica. In our area most of the large associations were ruled by men from "native" royal families (Strabo 326 ὑπὸ ἰθαγενῶν ἥρχοντο). But there were notable exceptions. The Molossoi chose Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, and his descendants as their kings; the Chaones stated that their kings were descended from Helenus of Troy; and the Lyncestae elected in the mid-fifth century a descendant of the Bacchiadae of Corinth as their king (Strabo 326). When a "native" was

<sup>11</sup> A stranger at Styberra had the ethnic Δοληνεστής (*Chiron* 18 [1988] 249); he came probably from this region.

<sup>12</sup> For other *komai*, see *HMac* I 89 f.

<sup>13</sup> See *HMac* I 114. Mr. N. D. Ziakas informed me by letter that the stone is still where Leake saw it.

<sup>14</sup> The meaning of political terms in Upper Macedonia may have differed from the meaning in southern Greece. In the inscription from Sisanion the term ἡ πολιτεία seems to mean the citizen body, which met in an ἐκκλησία, according to the inscription of the Battynaioi. In Epirus ἡ πόλις τῶν Χαόνων meant not a city-state but simply "the state" (*PAE* [1952] 298; *Epirus* 593); and in Illyris Sesarethos figured as a *polis* of the Taulantii, again a state rather than a city-state (Hecataeus, *FGrH* I F 103).

elected and the succession was in his family, the tribal group from which he had come was called the royal tribe; and if a newcomer was appointed, he was given the tribal affiliation of the royal tribe.

Because tribal affiliations were important, relationships were expressed in the genealogy of eponyms. Thus the sons of Neoptolemus and Andromache were "Molossos and Pielos and Pergamos, the youngest," and it was from Pielos that the kings of the Molossoi took their origin (Paus. 1. 11. 1-2). Since Pielos was the eponymous ancestor of the Peiales, it is evident that they were the royal tribe within the Molossian association both before and after the election of Neoptolemus. On the other hand, Pergamos was the eponymous ancestor of the Pergamii, a constituent tribe of the Chaones, and it seems that they were the royal tribe in that association; for the tradition was that after the death of Neoptolemus Andromache consorted with Helenus. Associations which had "native" kings were the Parauaioi, the Orestai, the Tymphaioi, the Elimeotai and the Pelagones (Thuc. 2. 80. 6, 2. 99. 2; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 89; Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 802 for Polyperchon). Great honours were paid to the kings, as we have seen recently in the remarkably fine tombs of the Elimeote kings in the fifth century at Aiiane.

Although the kings had extensive powers, they were constitutionally elected and had to deal with some form of Assembly, as we see from the exchange of oaths between the Molossian king and his Molossians at Passaron (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 5. 2) and from the expulsion of Aeacides by the κοινὸν δόγμα of the Epeirotai (Diod. 19. 36. 4). In the reign of Alexander I, c. 340, there is mention of an Assembly's decision—of the Molossoi or of a constituent tribe—which was recorded at Dodona: ἔδοξε τῶν ἐκκλησίαι τῶν . . . (*SGDI* 1335; *Epirus* 535). The monarchies of the tribal groups of Upper Macedonia were terminated by Philip II, but the administrative systems continued. Thus honours were paid to "King X, son of King X" by "Orestae" in the third century (*IG* XI. 4. 1118), and during the armistice in 197 the Orestae absconded to join Rome (Plb. 18. 47. 6). Troops were recruited territorially from the cantons of Upper Macedonia, and each canton continued to have its own citizenship, which was controlled by an internal administrative body.<sup>15</sup> Evidence of the meetings and decisions of such bodies survives from the period of the early Roman Empire.

We turn finally to the Macedones. They enter history in the fragment of a poem of Hesiod: "Magnes and Macedon . . . lived round Pieria and Olympus" (fr. 7 M-W). To Hesiod the Magnetes and the Macedones were Greek-speaking, since they were first cousins of Hellen's sons in his genealogy. In 1979 I marshalled the evidence and said the evidence was

<sup>15</sup> For the territorial regiments of infantry, see *Mac State* 163. The citizenship, e.g. of Alexander Lyncestes, has often been misunderstood as indicating that he was a prince of the Lyncestid royal house (e.g. Errington 60, "Abkömmling des lynkestischen Königshauses"). It simply meant that a man was a resident and a citizen of a canton, e.g. Lynceus. See *Mac State* 140 n. 8. See Arr. *An.* 6. 28. 4 and *Ind.* 18. 4-6.

conclusive that Hesiod was correct, and that the Macedones spoke, like the Magnetes, a local form of the Aeolic dialect of Greek. Since then M. Andronikos has unearthed a large number of names of leading Macedonians at Vergina, which lead independently to the certain conclusion that the Macedones of the early fourth century were Greek-speaking.<sup>16</sup> Their dialect differed from that of the tribes of Upper Macedonia; for instance, their magistrates were *πελιγόνες*, whereas those of Upper Macedonia were *πελιγῶνες*. Their dialect remained isolated over some centuries, because the summer pastures of "Pieria and Olympus" were adjacent to the winter pastures of the Pierian coast, whereas shepherds elsewhere had to move their flocks over great distances between the pastures of high Pindus and the lowlands of Epirus and Thessaly.

That the Macedones were an association of pastoral tribes is to be inferred not only from their habitat but also from all their early traditions. As such they had a royal tribe, which was recorded in genealogical form: Macedon had a son Argeas, whose descendants were the "Argeadae" (Steph. Byz. s.v. "Argeou"), and these "Argeadae Macedones," it was said, had come originally from Argos in Orestis (App. Syr. 63 Ἄργος τὸ ἐν Ὀρεστείᾳ, ὅθεν οἱ Ἀργεάδαι Μακεδόνες). It was this tribe which led the way in the conquest of the area round the river Axios (Strabo 7, fr. 11 and fr. 20), and it was to this tribe that "the Argead kings," whether "native" or adopted, belonged (Paus. 7. 8. 9 and App. Mac. fr. 2). It was incumbent on the Macedonian kings to carry out the traditional sacrifices of this tribe, the "Argeadika" (Ath. 14, 659f), and when a new king was chosen, "let the Macedones with the king celebrate the customary rites for the Argeadae" (PVindob. 31954).<sup>17</sup> Early in the seventh century the Macedones chose a newcomer as king, Perdiccas, a member of the Temenidae, descended from Heracles and rulers of Argos in the Peloponnese; and it was from Perdiccas' line that all kings were chosen down to Alexander IV.<sup>18</sup>

Perdiccas inherited the strong powers of the pastoral leader. He directed the founding of Aegeae at Vergina and the settling of pastoral groups in the Emathian plain, each as a πόλις, retaining its own institutions and citizenship. In other conquered areas, such as Eordaea, the pastoral system continued, and the Eordaiοι were a typical association of pastoral tribes with their own administration and citizenship. The Macedones, like the

<sup>16</sup> HMac II 39–54; M. Andronikos, *Vergina: The Royal Tombs* (Athens 1984) 84, who shows the evidence to be "unambivalent." To suppose that the Greek language was adopted from contact with Corinthian colonies, e.g. in the fifth century, by peoples as far inland as Pelagonia is absurd. Errington (13) accepted that the Macedones were Greek-speaking but hesitated about their "nationality" ("die Frage des wirklichen Volkstums . . . kann . . . nicht ausreichend beantwortet werden"). It is difficult to see what criterion other than language distinguished Illyrians and Thracians from the Macedones in the fifth century.

<sup>17</sup> See further in *Mac State* 16 f.

<sup>18</sup> Some still follow Abel's view of 1847 that this dynasty of kings did not come from Argos in the Peloponnese; see *Mac State* 19.



Molossoi, took an oath of loyalty to a new king,<sup>19</sup> and they served as the king's forces (Diod. 18. 16. 1 αἱ βασιλικαὶ δυνάμεις). We are afforded two insights into their status. Thucydides distinguished the Macedones proper, the conquering people, as οἱ Μακεδόνες οὗτοι (2. 99. 6), from the tribes of Upper Macedonia, which were semi-dependent and in a different sense "Macedones" (2. 99. 2).<sup>20</sup> Anaximenes, who was dealing only with the Macedones proper, stated that Alexander (in my opinion Alexander II, c. 369) widened the Royal Companionship, so that it included both the Companion Cavalrymen and the bulk of the infantrymen as Foot-Companions.<sup>21</sup> These men evidently had a higher status than the remainder of the armed forces, which had included, for instance, Greeks resident in the kingdom (Thuc. 4. 124. 1).

That the "Macedones" met often in "Assembly" was noted at the start of Philip's command, and at the time of Alexander's succession (Diod. 16. 3. 1 τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἐν συνεχέσιν ἐκκλησίαις; cf. 16. 4. 3 and 17. 2. 2); and the term for "Assembly" (ἐκκλησία) has political overtones, which are not to be ignored. The number of Macedones was greatly enlarged when Philip incorporated in his kingdom the cantons of Upper Macedonia and brought the elite troops of those cantons into his King's Forces. It was from these Forces that Alexander intended to send 10,000 men home in 324. They were correctly described as "the citizens" (Diod. 17. 109. 1 τῶν πολιτῶν), and it was before they returned home that Antipater found himself short of "citizen soldiers" (Diod. 18. 12. 2 ἐσπάνιζε γὰρ ἡ Μακεδονία στρατιωτῶν πολιτικῶν).

The king continued to deal with the use of conquered land and the distribution of the citizen families of Macedones. Alexander III in 335/4 "gave to Macedones Kalindoia" and other lands, hitherto cultivated by the Bottiaioi, so that the Assembly of Macedones could create a city of "Macedones." Philip V moved "citizen men with their wives and children" from cities of Lower Macedonia to settle on sites in inland Emathia (Plb. 23. 10. 4).<sup>22</sup> For their part the "Macedones" tried and decided all allegations of treason. The king and the Macedones were the two parts of the state. As such they both figured on the dedication for victory at Sellasia in 222: βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος βασιλέως Δημητρίου καὶ Μακεδόνες. As a

<sup>19</sup> See *Mac State* 65–67. G. T. Griffith wrote in *HMac* II 386 f. that an oath to a new king "seems established," but he did not develop a case.

<sup>20</sup> The other peoples in this chapter (Pieres, Bottiaei, Eordoi, Almopes, Grestones and Bisaltai) were not then, and never became, "Macedones," although they were subject to the rule of the Macedonian king within Macedonia under Philip II and his successors.

<sup>21</sup> *FGrH* 72 F 4, cited in *HMac* II 706 by G. T. Griffith, who held that the Alexander of the fragment was Alexander the Great. See *Mac State* 98 for my reasons.

<sup>22</sup> The evidence that "Macedones" were an elite group within the Macedonian kingdom is irrefutable. See most recently the inscription from the site of Kalindoia in which the land of the Greek-speaking Bottiaioi in inland Chalcidice was transferred by Alexander in 335/4 to "Macedones." See *CQ* 38 (1988) 386 and M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Bulletin épigraphique," *REG* 101 (1988) 444 ff.

“community” the “Macedones” honoured their king, Philip V, in a dedication at Delos (*IG* XI. 4. 1102):

τὸ κοινὸν Μ[ακε]δόν[ων]  
βασιλέα Φί[λιππον βασιλέως]  
Δημητρίου ἀ[ρετῆς ἕνεκα]  
καὶ εὐνοία[ς Ἀπόλλωνι]

*Clare College, Cambridge*